

*The Peril of being Zealously
Affected, but not Well:*

O R,
REFLECTIONS

O N
Dr. SACHEVEREL'S
SERMON.

Preach'd before

The Right Honourable the Lord Mayor,
Aldermen, and Citizens of London, at
the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on
the Fifth of November, 1709.

*A false Witness that speaketh Lyes, and him that soweth
Discord among Brethren, the Lord hates; Prov. 6, 19.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for J. Baker at the Black Boy in Patern-
oster-Row. M. DCC. IX.

Where may be had, *The Modest Reply to Sacheverell
and Lesley.*

I Pass over abundance of Exceptions that might be made both to the Stile and Matter of the Dedication and Sermon, and confine my self to those things that I take to be of the most dangerous tendency to our happy Constitution. The first I take notice of, is a *Glaring one*, to use the Doctor's own Phrase; which, by the way, seems fitter for the Stage than the Pulpit: and that is *Dedic. p. 1.* where he condemns *Appeals to the People as the only Judges of Right and Wrong, and the dernier Resort of Justice and Dominion, as Rebellious.* 'Tis a common and true Maxim, *That crafty Men deal in Generals*; and here the Doctor gives us a notable Cast of his Craft: For he does not tell us who he means by People, who must certainly be Judges in all Cases whatever betwixt them and their Prince, either in their Collective or Representative Capacity; or by the ordinary Courts of Judicature establish'd by Law, which is their Act as well as the Prince's. If he means every Individual of the Nation, he combates an Adversary that no body sets up, any farther than to allow every one a Judgment of Discretion, as to what they are to believe and practise, in Matters upon which their Salvation depends. And this was allow'd by our Saviour to the whole Jewish Nation, whom he commanded to *search the Scriptures, because they testify'd of him*, John 5. 39. But the Doctor seems more inclinable to the Romish Maxim, *That Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion*; because 'tis the surest Foundation for their Doctrine of *Implicit Faith*: which the Doctor and his Faction do really contend for, tho they don't own it. But I can tell him to his mortification, from very good Authority, that the People whom such Pharisaical Doctors as himself reckon'd accursed, made a truer Judgment of our Saviour and his Doctrine, than all the Learned Rabbis of the Church, John 7. 49. And the Apostles, who were infallible in Doctrine, submitted what they deliver'd to the same Trial by the People, and gave the Epithet of *Noble* to the Bereans, because they judg'd of it by that Test, Acts 17. 11.

I hope the Doctor will not deny a Power of Judgment to the Church; and if he grant that, he must needs allow it to the People, if our Church teach us truly in her 19th Article, where she tells us, "The Church Visible is a Congregation of Faithful Men, in which the pure Word of God is preach'd, and the Sacraments duly minister'd according to Christ's Ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same:" This certainly takes in all the Congregations in England that are so qualify'd. And I believe the Doctor will scarce have the front to deny that the People are a much greater part of the Church than the Priests, and that the Convocation or Synod act only as the Representative of the Church, as is expressly declar'd by Can. 139. And every one knows that Representatives derive their Authority from those they represent, which is all the Faithful People of the Church of England, if her 19th Article be true.

true. Had the Doctor consulted our antient Historians, he might have found that the People either by themselves or their Representatives were the dernier Resort of Justice and Dominion. My Time and Bounds will not allow me to multiply Instances, which might be easily done; therefore I refer those who are willing to be truly inform'd on this important Subject, to a Book call'd, *An Historical and Political Discourse of the Laws and Government of England, &c. Collected from the Manuscript Notes of John Selden Esq; by Nathaniel Bacon of Grays-Inn Esq; Printed for John Starkey in 1689.* Where they will find uncontrovertible Proofs of it: and those who would see the Assertions of Dr. Brady, and other Prerogative Authors to the contrary fully answer'd, may consult Mr. Tyrrel's *History, and the Introductions to his several Volumes.*

In this matter our Ancestors acted according to the best Precedent, if we may call the Scripture so, with the Doctor's allowance; who, pag. 9. seems to set those he calls *Antient Writers* upon a level with it. For we find that *Samuel*, who was a Judge of God's own Appointment, when the People of *Israel* would needs have a King, appeal'd to them for the Justice of his own Administration, bid them witness against him if he had taken any Man's Ox or Ass, defrauded, oppress'd them, or taken any Bribes to blind his Eyes, and promis'd Restitution if they could prove it: upon which he was acquitted by their unanimous Declaration, of any such Practice, *1 Sam. 12. 3, 4.* Now here was an Appeal to the People, by a Governor of God's immediate Appointment, as Judges of Right and Wrong in the dernier Resort. So that either the Doctor must condemn *Samuel* as a Rebel, and a Teacher of Rebellious Doctrine, or submit to the Charge of being a false Teacher himself, and an Enemy to the unchangeable Laws of God, the Author of Government, as well as to our own Laws and Constitution; according to which the late *K. James* was dethron'd, for violating his own Coronation-Oath, and our fundamental Laws.

Then as to the People's being *Judges of Dominion, as well as of Right and Wrong* in the dernier Resort, 'tis every whit as plain; for *Samuel* by God's own direction hearken'd to the People, in changing their Form of Government, inform'd them of the Manner or Law of the Kingdom, wrote it in a Book, and laid it up before the Lord, *1 Sam. 10. 25.* And that the People were to judge in the dernier Resort whether this Law was observ'd or not, is not only plain from his Appeal to them, as to his own Administration; but from the 17th of *Deuteronomy*, where the way of electing a King, and his Manner of Government, is deliver'd to the People by *Moses*; and from the Practice of the *Israelites*, who by God's Approbation abdicated *Rehoboam*, because he would not govern according to that Law, nor redress the Infractions that his Father *Solomon* had made upon it, in many notorious Instances, *1 Kings 12, &c.*

Besides, this Right of the People is not only evident from these and many other unanswerable Instances of Scripture, but

from the very nature of the thing, and all Notions of Sovereign and Independent Government: For if every Sovereign Government had not a dernier Resort within themselves, they must be dependent somewhere or other; and that must either be upon an Universal Monarch or the Pope, who knowing there was not nor could be any such thing as the former in the world, did blasphemously assume that Power to himself over every one that is call'd God: but his Pretensions have been combated in all Ages, even by Emperors and Princes of his own Communion; as is evident to all who know but the first Elements of History: and that Power has been declar'd by those call'd General Councils to be vested in the People of all Nations, by themselves or their Representatives. Otherwise no Controversies betwixt Princes and their Subjects could be determin'd, without an Appeal to a foreign Judicature somewhere or other; which, as I said before, destroys all Notions of Sovereignty, unless we place it in an universal Monarch. And as God never appointed any such, we have no way left to decide such Controversies, but by the Body of the People, or their Representatives, as was practis'd by God's own People the *Jews*, according to his own Direction; without referring them to the eldest of *Adam* or *Noah's* Line, who must certainly have had the Right of Dominion, had it been founded on Primogeniture by a Divine Law, as the Doctor and his Faction contend. Therefore certainly he does not deserve the Name of a Christian, who will not own the Scripture, the approv'd Practice of the People of God recorded in it, and the very Nature and End of Government, to be the only Rule we can safely follow in deciding Controversies of that kind: and that this was by Appeal to the People or their Representatives, as Judges in the dernier Resort, is plain from what I have said above.

And that the Church (which according to the Articles of the Church of *England*, as I have prov'd already, is the Body of the faithful People, with their Pastors and Rulers) are by themselves, or their true Representatives, Judges of Religious Matters, according to the Canon of the Scriptures, is evident from *Artic. 20.* and *Canon 139.* abovemention'd, and from the Practice of our Ancestors, which the Reader may find unanswerably prov'd in *Selden's* Book already quoted, page 23, &c. And that our Progenitors acted in this according to the Apostolical Practice and Pattern, is evident from *Acts 15.* where we have an account of the only thing that can justly be call'd an Oecumenical and unerring Synod; where the *Multitude*, the whole Church was present, and join'd with the Apostles in their Decree about Circumcision, Idolatry, Fornication, Things strangled, and Blood; *Ver. 4, 6, 12, 22, & 23.*

Having thus overturn'd the Doctor's Foundation, the weak Superstructures he has built upon it must fall of course: And it plainly appears, That our Constitution in Church and State, for which he pretends such a Zeal, is attack'd by none so violently as by himself, and those of his Principles; who, under pretence of supporting it, do actually undermine it: which makes him

and his Party liable to all the Anathema's, Hell and Damnation, that with so much Noise and little Sense he threatens to others; for instead of the false Charge which he brings against moderate Churchmen, and those he thinks fit to call Fanaticks, whom he will have to be the united Friends and Brethren of the Papists, he makes it evident, that he himself, and his Faction, are justly chargeable with it, and that they fall in with the Designs of those who are for a Popish Prince, and a French Government: whereas the moderate Churchmen and Dissenters have given undeniable Proofs of their unbiass'd and steady Zeal to the Government, during the Reigns of the late King *William* and Queen *Mary*, and of her present Majesty, whose Title they took care to insert in the Intail by the Declaration of Rights at the Revolution, and enter'd into Associations for the Support of it long before she came to the Crown, as may be seen by the Originals, now laid up in the Tower. This, together with their whole Conduct, and their Readiness to support the Publick Credit, by subscribing to Parliamentary Funds for keeping her Majesty in Possession against the French King and the Pretender, whom he sent over to dethrone her, in Concurrence with our Papists and Jacobites, is such a bright and manifest proof of their Affection and Zeal for her Majesty's Person and Government, as the Doctor and his High-Church Faction cannot pretend to.

So that we may justly return them his Advice, either to strike the fifth Commandment out of the Decalogue, or to shew that they believe it, by a more loyal Conduct than they have hitherto practis'd. For can any one in his Senses believe that such Men as he are Friends to her Majesty's Government, and the Constitution, who assert the Absolute Illegality of resisting Princes, on any pretence whatsoever, as he does, p. 12. when all the World knows, that her Majesty her self, and her late Husband the Prince, join'd those that took Arms against her Father, out of a Sense of the superior Obligation they were under to God and their Country, whose Religion, Laws, and Constitution, that unhappy Prince had openly invaded, and design'd totally to subvert? By this it appears, that if Resistance be unlawful on any pretence whatever, her Majesty was guilty of an unnatural Rebellion, and of an unjust Usurpation, by suffering her Intail to be inserted in the Claim of Right, and by actually entring upon the Government according to it, upon the Death of those, who by that Intail had the Precedency. Every one knows, that this was contrary to her Father's Will, who came with an Army to repossess himself of the Government of which he had been justly depriv'd, and who had provided another Heir for his Dominions, with a design to exclude her late and present Majesty, and all his other Protestant Relations. Is not this a plain Demonstration that the Doctor, and his Faction, are arriv'd at a Superlative degree of Impudence, to assert so boldly, that Resistance is in no case lawful, when without it we had never been blessed with her Majesty's Government, the most happy and successful in all

respects we ever yet had? And is it not equally impudent
 to assert the Subjects Obligation to an absolute and unconditional
 Obedience to the Supreme Power in all things lawful, when the
 Representatives of the Kingdom, both in Convention and Parli-
 ament, justify'd the deposing of the late King *James*, because
 he acted contrary to his Coronation Oath, establish'd by Acts of
 Parliament time out of mind, as the original Contract and Basis
 of our Government? His Subterfuge of restraining our uncon-
 ditional Obedience to things lawful, will stand him in no stead,
 since he discovers his Hypocrisy by declaring against Resistance
 on any pretence whatsoever, which takes in things unlawful as
 well as lawful. Is he not as plainly guilty of a rebellious At-
 tack upon our Constitution; since by the first of *William* and
Mary, chap. VI. the Coronation-Oath is establish'd, and 'tis there
 declar'd, that by the Law and antient Usage of this Realm the
 Kings and Queens thereof have taken a solemn Oath upon the
 Evangelists, at their respective Coronations, to maintain the
 Statutes, Laws, and Customs of the said Realm, and the Peo-
 ple and Inhabitants thereof, in their Spiritual and Civil Rights
 and Properties? With what Assurance then can this Orator and
 Amanuensis of the Jacobite Mob say, that we did owe, or do
 owe absolute and unconditional Obedience, contrary to the known
 Laws of the Land, which oblige us to conditional Obedience,
 according to the Statute, and no otherwise? Or how can this
 Advocate of Slavery have the face to say, that Resistance, upon
 any pretence whatever, is unlawful, since by Chap. 2. Sess. 2.
 of the first of *William* and *Mary*, Sect. 9. 'tis declar'd, "That
 " all and every Person and Persons that is, are, or shall be
 " reconcil'd to, or shall hold Communion with the See or
 " Church of *Rome*, or shall profess the Popish Religion, or shall
 " marry a Papist; shall be excluded, and be for ever incapable
 " to inherit, possess, or enjoy the Crown and Government of
 " this Realm and *Ireland*, and the Dominions thereunto belong-
 " ing, or any part of the same; or to have, use, or exercise any
 " Regal Power, Authority, or Jurisdiction within the same: and
 " in all and in every such Case or Cases, the People of these
 " Realms shall be, and are hereby absolv'd of their Allegiance,
 " and the said Crown and Government shall from time to time
 " descend to, and be enjoy'd by such Person or Persons being
 " Protestants, as should have inherited and enjoy'd the same in case
 " the said Person or Persons so reconcil'd holding Communion,
 " or professing, or marrying, as aforesaid, were naturally dead?"

Now let this acute Doctor, with all his Philosophy and starch'd
 pedantick Oratory, which is as far from good Language as a pain-
 ted Strumpet is from a real Beauty, avoid the force of this Law
 if he can; and tell us how a King or Queen, acting contrary to
 it, can be dispossest'd without Resistance, if they should offer
 to keep the Throne notwithstanding? and whether the People,
 who are absolv'd from Allegiance to them in such a Case, would
 not be Traitors both to Church and State, if they did not pull
 them down from it?

'Tis in vain for him, with his Brother in Iniquity the *Re-bearfal*, to alledg the contrary Statute of *Charles II.* in his defence; for 'tis impossible they can both be in force at the same time: every one knows that a later Law supercedes a former of a contrary Tendency, tho it be not expressely repeal'd. Besides, let him and his Faction consider, how they can reconcile their slavish Doctrine with the Declaration of the Rights and Liberties of the Subject inserted in the same Act, and the Reasons for their deposing the late *K. James.* Does he think, that *K. William* and *Q. Mary* made that Act, by and with the Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in Parliament assembled, to be a mere *Brutum fulmen*, or inanimate Scare-Crow, and not as a Beacon to warn future Princes to beware of the same Shelves upon which their Predecessors suffer'd Shipwreck? Or with what face can he call the Unlawfulness of resisting Princes, on any Pretence whatsoever, the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, after such an Act made by the Consent of the Fathers of the Church, the Lords Spiritual, and with the Consent of the Representatives of the Clergy as well as of others in the House of Commons; especially since the Convocation then sitting, which by the Canon is declar'd to be the Representative of the Church of *England*, made no Exceptions or Protections against it, but on the contrary met by virtue of the same Authority which enacted it; and all the benefic'd Clergy, except an inconsiderable number that were depos'd, took the Oaths to their Majesties, and swore to bear true Allegiance to them upon the very foot of this Declaration of Rights, that abdicated *K. James*, and which all future Kings and Queens are oblig'd to subscribe, and audibly to repeat upon their coming to the Crown?

'Tis in vain for the Doctor to have recourse to the antient Doctrine, or Practice of our first Protestant Church, as an Apology for his slavish Principles: every one knows that the Bishops and Clergy in *Queen Elizabeth's* Time gave Money to her Majesty to support the Protestants of *France*, *Holland*, and *Scotland*, who had taken Arms against the Tyranny of their respective Sovereigns; which is a plain Demonstration that neither Head, Body, nor Tail of our Church, did at that time understand Passive Obedience in the Sense of our *Laudean* Chaplain, and his Associates. 'Tis likewise very well known, that our Bishops were the chief Persons who solicited *Q. Elizabeth*, not only to deprive *Mary Queen of Scots* of the Succession, but likewise to take away her Life, tho to the Plea of her being presumptive Heiress to the Crown of *England*, she added that of her being a Sovereign and Independent Princess, as *Queen of Scotland*; and with the Bishops both Houses of Parliament concur'd, as appears by *Sir Simon D' Ewes's* Journal, from Page 207 to Page 406. The Doctor, if he pleases, may join the Day of her Execution with the Fifth of *November*, and the Thirtieth of *January*, and then he brings in his own Church for a Snack. I would

advise him, in his next Catalogue of Traitors, to put in the Bishop and Martyr *Ridley* to bear Archbishop *Grindal* company, since the former in a Sermon at *Paul's-Cross*, preach'd to the People against receiving *Q. Mary*, because she wou'd bring in a foreign Power to reign over them, and subvert the Protestant Religion; for if this good Father be not defam'd as a Traitor, his Practice may be an ill Precedent for some of our present Bishops to preach against receiving the Pretender.

This is enough to prove, that the Doctrine of Non-resistance on any Pretence whatsoever, was not the Characteristick of the old Protestant Church of *England*; nor was it so in the Reigns of *K. James* or *K. Charles I.* for both those Princes assisted the *Germans* and *French*, who had taken Arms against their oppressive Sovereigns, and sent Forces to join 'em. And who shou'd understand the Doctrine of the Church, better than those three of her successive Heads? That the Body of the Church understood it as little in his sense, is evident from the Parliaments of *Charles I.* and particularly that of 41, the far greater part of whom, tho profess'd Members of the Church of *England*, yet took Arms against *K. Charles* for levying Mony, &c. contrary to Law; which tho 'twas defended, and the Power of Parliaments run down by Archbishop *Laud* and his Faction, yet 'twas unanswerably confuted by Archbishop *Abbot*: and 'tis very well known, that Archbishop *Williams* took Arms against the King, and the Body of the Clergy concur'd with the Parliament, tho eight in ten of 'em were Church of *England-men*, as appear'd by their ready Conformity to the Church of *England*, upon the Restoration of *K. Charles II.*

So that if, at any time, it cou'd be said, that Non-resistance, in the Doctor's sense, was the Characteristick of our Church, it must have been in that Reign: and yet, 'tis plain, by the Proceedings of that very Parliament, which enacted the slavish Clause against Resistance on any Pretence whatever, that they did not understand it in the sense of the Dr. and his Brethren; for they themselves oppos'd that Prince to his Face, impeach'd his Ministry for acting contrary to Law, and advising him to arbitrary Measures, oppos'd his Toleration by his dispensing Power, press'd for a Redress of the Nation's Grievances, and Security from Popery and Popish Councils, and remonstrated against his Alliance with *France*, and his evil Counsellors. 'Tis likewise well known, how vigorously they prosecuted the Popish Plot, tho they knew the Court to be in it, and that the Commons pass'd a Bill of Exclusion against the D. of *York*, and sent it up to the House of Lords, where the then Bishops had so far degenerated from their Predecessors in *Q. Elizabeth's* Time, that they threw it out. The same Parliament continu'd so vigorous in opposing the Popish and Arbitrary Measures of the Court, that the King at last thought fit to dissolve them. Now I wou'd fain know, whether those who made the Law are not the best Judges of its Meaning; and since their Meaning is best understood by their Practice, with what

face can he say, that they intended an absolute and unconditional Obedience by that Act, or to damn all Resistance on any Pretence whatsoever, when they themselves resisted the King's express and declar'd Will, impeach'd his Ministers for putting it in Execution, and were for excluding his Brother from the Crown, because they foresaw he wou'd bring in Tyranny and Popery? We must own indeed, if by the Church of *England* we are to understand the Clergy, that most of 'em ran to an extravagant height in that Reign, and carry'd the Parliament's Clause against Resistance far beyond whatever the Lords and Commons intended; but if the Laity be the Majority of the Church, as certainly they are, 'tis evident from the general Discontents of the Nation at the Popish and Arbitrary Proceedings of the Court, that Passive Obedience was not the Characteristick of our Church, but merely of a Faction, who assum'd the Name, even in that Reign.

When K. *James II.* came to the Crown, and that his luxurious Priests had a mind to share the Tithe-Egg, Pigs, and Pullets, and the fat Benefices with our Clergy, they then forgot their Passive Obedience so much, that they preach'd and writ against the King's Administration, refus'd to read his Declaration of Indulgence, and both Clergy and Laity concur'd in the Revolution: nay Archbishop *Sancroft* himself, with several other of the golden Candlesticks, as the seven petitioning Bishops were then call'd, tho some of 'em afterwards prov'd Brass, invited the P. of *Orange* to take the Administration upon him: which was a plain Demonstration, that either they were Knaves, or did not believe one word of that Passive Obedience themselves, the belief of which they urg'd upon others, on pain of Damnation. And what can the Doctor think of that Archbishop's going to the Tower in Person, to demand the Keys of K. *James's* Lieutenant, and putting 'em into the Hands of the late *Ld Lucan*?

Here I cannot but take notice of Dr. *S's* Assurance, who so boldly asserts, *pag. 13.* That the Prince of *Orange* solemnly disclaim'd the least Imputation of Resistance in his Declaration, when the contrary so manifestly appears by the very words of it, Declaration 1. Art. 21. where he declares, *That he brought with him a Force sufficient, by the Blessing of God, to defend him against the Violence of King James's evil Counsellors.* Now how he could make this Defence without Resistance, and for what other end he put himself in Arms, let this acute Doctor tell us if he can. But he who has the Impudence to deny matter of fact so well known to all the World, may say what he pleases: the Declaration it self, Art. 25. invites the whole Nation to join with the Prince in the execution of his Design against all such as should oppose him.

'Tis also evident that the Lords and Gentlemen, who join'd him at *Exeter*, enter'd into an Association for the Defence of our Religion, antient Government, Laws and Liberties; wherein they solemnly engag'd, that if any Attempt were made upon the
Prince

Prince of *Orange*, they wou'd pursue those who made it, with all their Adherents, and those whom they found in Arms against him, with the utmost Severity of a just Revenge to their Ruin and Destruction. They enter'd into this solemn Association with the Prince's Consent; by all which, and the Skirmishes that happen'd betwixt the Prince's Forces and those of the King at *Wincanton* and *Redding*, where several were kill'd on both sides, 'tis evident that the Prince both declar'd for and practis'd Resistance in case of Opposition. From whence we may see what Credit is to be given to such a Preacher, who in the Cathedral of *St. Paul's* had the Impudence to publish such a notorious, deliberate and study'd Falshood, which many of his Hearers must certainly know to be such. His Quotation from *Dr. Kennet's* History to prove what he says, affords him no Relief; for that part of the Declaration asserts only that the Prince intended no Conquest: and if *Dr. S.* will infer from thence that the Prince declar'd against Resistance, he ought to be sent to School again to learn his Logick.

To conclude this Point, I wou'd advise the Doctor, for understanding what is very improperly call'd Passive-Obedience, to read the Commentary, which the Nobility, Gentry and Commonalty assembled in Arms at *Nottingham*, where her present Majesty join'd them, put upon it as follows.

" We own it Rebellion to resist a King that governs by Law ;
 " but he was always accounted a Tyrant that made his Will the
 " Law : and to resist such a one, we justly esteem no Rebellion,
 " but a necessary Defence. And in this Consideration we doubt
 " not of all honest Mens Assistance, &c." I wou'd also advise
 him to read the Letter of his Royal Highness the Prince of *Den-*
mark to the late King *James*, wherein there are these remarkable
 and excellent Expressions.

" I am not ignorant of the frequent Mischiefs wrought in the
 " World by factious Pretences of Religion ; but were not Religion
 " the most justifiable Cause, 'twou'd not be made the most
 " specious Pretence — How then can I longer disguise my
 " just Concern for that Religion, in which I have been so happily
 " educated, which my Judgment thorowly convinceth me
 " to be the best, and for the Support of which I am so highly interested
 " in my native Country ? And is not *England* now by
 " the most indearing Tie become so ?

" While the restless Spirits of the Enemies of the Reform'd
 " Religion, back'd by the cruel Zeal and prevailing Power of
 " *France*, justly alarm and unite all the Protestant Princes of
 " *Christendom*, and engage them in so vast an Expence for the
 " Support of it ; can I act so degenerate and mean a part, as to
 " deny my Concurrence to such worthy Endeavours, for the dis-
 " abusing of your Majesty, by the Reinforcement of those Laws,
 " and the Re-establishment of that Government, on which alone
 " depends the Well-being of your Majesty, and of the Prote-
 " stant Religion in *Europe* ? This, Sir, is that irresistible and
 " only

“ only Cause that cou’d come in competition with my Duty
 “ and Obligations to your Majesty, and be able to tear me from
 “ you, while the same affectionate Desire of serving you con-
 “ tinues in me.”

This is a sufficient Justification of the Prince, and of her present Majesty, who as they were illustrious Examples of conjugal Love, did certainly act by concert in this most important Passage of their Lives.

The Letter of the Lord *Churchil*, now Duke of *Marlborough*, to the late King upon the same Subject, with the Address of the Lord *Dartmouth*, then Admiral, from himself and the other Commanders in the Fleet, may also deserve the Libeller’s Consideration, and put him to the blush, that Laymen should so much better understand the true meaning of that call’d Passive-Obedience than himself, and his hot-headed Brethren of the Clergy. I shall add no more on this Subject, but only put him in mind that the Prince of *Orange*, by the 14th Article of his first Declaration, expresses himself against his Doctrine of absolute and unconditional Obedience. So that upon the whole, we leave it to the Consideration of all unbiass’d Persons, whether it be the Whigs, or he and his Brethren, who run down our Constitution by villanous and seditious Principles, as he expresses it, pag. 14. which is Language fitter for a Beargarden than a Pulpit.

Supposing that the Doctor has by this time his Belly full of Non-resistance and Passive Obedience both from Scripture and Law, I come next to his false Brethren, and shall give Archbishop *Grindal* the Precedency, because his Character requires it. The Libeller modestly calls him a *false Son of the Church*, and a *perfidious Prelate*, pag. 19. and charges him with having deluded *Q. Elizabeth* to give a Toleration to the *Genevan* Discipline. But I am afraid that the Doctor by this Charge has prov’d himself to be a malicious Slanderer; for if we may believe *Bp Godwin* in his *Commentarius de Prasulibus Anglie*, he gives that worthy Prelate the Character of “ a pious and grave Man, who upon his return
 “ from Exile in the Reign of *Queen Mary*, was first made Bishop
 “ of *London*, then Archbishop of *York*, and at last Archbishop of
 “ *Canterbury*; and that he stood very high a long time in *Q. Elizabeth*’s Favour, until by the crafty Tricks of some People he
 “ quite lost it; they having accus’d him as a Favourer of the
 “ Conventicles, and Meetings for Prophecy, as they were then
 “ call’d, of turbulent Ministers: whereas indeed the true Cause
 “ was, because he condemn’d the unlawful Marriage of *Julius*,
 “ an *Italian* Physician, with another Man’s Wife, contrary to
 “ the Endeavours of the Earl of *Leicester*, who was then the
 “ Queen’s chief Favourite.” This is supported by the Authority of *Cambden*; and I hope every body will allow the Evidence of two such great Men to be more than sufficient to ballance that of *Dr. Sacheverell*. But allowing Archbishop *Grindal*’s Favour to the Puritans, and Moderation towards them to be true, can any
 Man

Man blame him for it, considering the Favour that he and others of the Church of *England* found among those of the *Geneva* way, while they themselves were Confessors and Exiles in the Reign of *Q. Mary*? But if this were enough to intitle him a false Brother and perfidious Prelate, I am afraid that most of his Brethren the reforming Bishops will be found in the same Category; for it appears by such Writings of our first Reformers as are come to our hands, that Archbishop *Cranmer*, the Bishop of *St. Asaph*, Dr. *Cox* Bishop of *Ely*, the otherways very high, *Thirlby*, *Redman*, Archbishop *Whitgift*, and Bishop *Jewel*, the great Ornament of the Protestant Church, were of Opinion, that Presbyter and Bishop were not different Orders by Divine Institution: so that according to the Doctor, pag. 10. those great Lights of the Church of *England* were all Apostates from their Order, and false Brethren. By which we may see what a Friend the Libeller and his Party is to our Reformation, which according to them is deriv'd to us from a parcel of Apostates. Some ill-natur'd People will be apt to alledg, that the rejecting the Pope's Authority, to whom the antient and modern *Laudean* Faction wou'd willingly grant the right hand of Fellowship, as the Primate or first Bishop of *Christendom*, is at the bottom of this Charge. If Dr. *Sacheverell* thinks this Censure a little too uncharitable, he may consult an antient Evidence, call'd *Laudensium Autocat. acrisis*, i. e. the *Laudeans* Self-Condernation, printed in 1641. or a more modern one, entitl'd, *Regale & Pontificate*, with some *Irish* Ecclesiastical Evidence, that meet now and then at a Club within a Mile of *St. Dunstons* in *Fleetstreet*, where there's a Consult about preaching up Resistance to the Queen, and Non-resistance to the Pretender, under the specious Pretext of Passive-Obedience, and Zeal for the Monarchy and the Church.

The Doctor ought to have well consider'd *St. Paul's* Description of a Presbyter and Bishop, in his Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, where those worthy Prelates and others thought they appear plainly to be one and the same; and I hope he will not call *St. Paul* an Apostate. Let him consult Bishop *Jewel's* Defence of his Apology of the Church of *England*, pag. 121. and he will find that great and learned Prelate to be of the same Opinion, and to laugh at *Harding* the Papist for objecting it to him, since *St. Jerome*, *St. Chrysostom*, and *Erasmus*, besides many others, had advanc'd it before him. If he consult Dr. *Stillingfleet's* *Irenicum*, pag. 392, 393, 395. he may also find that the famous Martyr and Archbishop, *Cranmer*, and others of our first Protestant Bishops and ablest Divines, were all of that mind. And so far were they from being Apostates from the Church of *England* in this matter, that it appears to have been the antient Doctrine of our Church by the Canons of *Ælfric ad Wulfsum Episcopum*, in *Lambert's Saxon Laws*, pag. 127. which was writ in the time of the *Saxon* Government. And that this continu'd to be the Doctrine of the Church of *England* as far down as *Henry VIII.* appears by the Book entitl'd, *A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for a Christen Man,*

Man, set forth by that King, with the Approbation and Consent of the Church. So that upon the whole, 'tis the Doctor and his Faction, and not our worthy Reformers, and those who follow them in their moderate Principles, who are Apostates from the Church of *England*: for by her definition of a Church already mention'd from *Article 19*. it appears that she does not make a Bishop as distinct from a Presbyter necessary for constituting a Church; nor was she so uncharitable in 1603. when she made her Canons, as to unchurch those who wanted such Bishops, according to the unwarrantable Practice of our modern Highfliers; for by *Canon 55*. she expressly orders her Ministers before Sermon "to pray for Christ's holy Catholick Church, i. e. for the " whole Congregation of Christian People throout the World, " and especially for the Churches of *England, Scotland, and Ireland*." Tho at that time the Church of *Scotland* not only had no Bishops, but had thrown them out before, and Presbytery was establish'd there on the same foot as at present, by Act of Parliament in 1592. He may likewise find by Archbishop *Spotswood's* History, Ann. 1609. pag. 514. that when King *James* had establish'd Bishops in *Scotland*, and sent for them to be consecrated by the English Bishops, Dr. *Andrews* Bishop of *Ely* objected against their Consecration, alledging that they ought first to be ordain'd Presbyters; but Archbishop *Bancroft*, tho high enough for Episcopacy, answer'd him, there was no necessity for that, seeing where Bishops could not be had, the Ordination by Presbyters must be esteem'd lawful, otherwise it may be doubted if there were any lawful Vocation in most of the Reform'd Churches. This Answer was applauded by the rest of the Bishops, upon which the Bishop of *Ely* acquiesc'd, and the *Scots* Bishops were consecrated; so tender was the Hierarchy of our Church then of giving that Offence to the foreign Protestant Churches, of which the Doctor and the rest of our schismatical Highfliers at present make so little scruple.

Another remarkable Instance to prove that this unwarrantable Doctrine is of no long standing in the Church of *England*, is that of our Deputies to the Synod of *Dort*; who tho several of them were Bishops, and Dr. *Davenant* of *Salisbury* particularly, who thought Episcopacy to be *Jure Divino*, yet they treated the Reform'd Churches beyond Sea as true Churches, and their Deputies as Brethren, tho all of them in their Confessions had expressly asserted, that there was no Church-Officer superior to a Presbyter by Divine Institution. So little had the uncharitable and unchristian Opinions of our *Dodwell's*, *Hicks's*, *Lesley's*, *Higgins's*, and *Sacheverell's* obtain'd then in the Church of *England*. 'Tis true, *Land* and his Faction endeavour'd to promote this Opinion, but they were oppos'd by others of more eminent Piety and Learning, and particularly by Dr. *Holland* the King's Professor at *Oxford*, who branded *Land* with publick Infamy, for asserting the Divine Right of Episcopacy, as we are inform'd by *Spanheim*, *Par. Spec.* p. 221. Nor are we to wonder at this, since the

the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*, the earliest Witnesses against Anti-christ, deny'd any difference betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, as is own'd by *Alphonfus de Castro*, fol. 102. And the Day-Stars of our Reformation, *Wicliff* and his Followers, are own'd by that same Author to have been of the like Opinion: and *John Huss*, who was *Wicliff*'s Disciple, with the *Bohemians*, maintain'd the same Doctrine, as *Aeneas Sylvius de Bohemorum Origine*, cap. 53. informs us: and the Council of *Trent* it self, as may be seen by their History, p. 596, 605, &c. does expressly own, that this was always one of the chief Doctrines of those who oppos'd *Rome*. And that the *English* State was of the same Opinion, appears undeniably true by the Statute of Provisors of the 25th of *Edward III. Anno Dom. 1350.* wherein 'tis asserted, "That the Holy Church of *England* was founded in the Estate of Prelacy with- in the Realm of *England* by *Edward I.* and his Progenitors, and the Earls, Barons, and other Nobles of his Realm, and their Ancestors, to inform them and the People of the Law of God, and to make Hospitalities, Alms, and other Works of Charity." So that there can be nothing more express to prove, that the *English* Prelacy is a Creature of the State. Therefore *ABp Cranmer*, who was the chief Instrument of our Reformation, had reason not to own Episcopacy as a distinct Order from Presbytery, but only as a prudent Constitution of the Civil Magistrate, for the better governing of the Church; as *Dr. Stillingfleet* informs us, *Irenic.* p. 393. And after the Doctor has prov'd there, that *ABp Whitgift*, and with him the whole Body of the *English* Episcopal Divines, were of the same Judgment, he concludes thus: "By which Principles the Divine Right of Episcopacy, as founded on Apostolical Practice, is quite subverted and destroy'd."

By this we may see how far *Dr. S's* Charge of Apostacy reaches both the Church and State of *England*, since it not only condemns our Clergy-Reformers and Martyrs, but even the Royal Martyr himself; for he gave his Royal Assent to the Abolition of Episcopacy in *Scotland*, and in his Proposals to the Parliament of *England* agreed likewise to give it up in this Kingdom for a certain number of years, until the matter were more fully debated; as is known to every Man who has read the History of those Times. One would have thought the Doctor should have consider'd of an Apology for the Royal Martyr, before he had pronounc'd so rash a Charge against all those who affirm that the Divine Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy is a novel Doctrine, not sufficiently warrant'd by Scripture; and that 'tis indifferent whether the Church be govern'd by Bishops or Presbyters, p. 10. For had *K. Charles I.* thought the contrary to be *Casus Confessionis*, he would rather have laid down his Crown, than so far have wounded his Conscience, as to consent to the abolishing of Episcopacy.

Dr. S. should also have had some compassion upon his Brethren, the Bishops and Episcopal Party in *Scotland*, for whom his Faction is at this very day making large Collections, to support them under what they call a most barbarous Persecution; For I

can prove to him by his own Doctrine, that they are nothing but a parcel of wretched Apostates. By the first Act of the second Session of the first Parliament of K. Charles II. there, the Archbishops and Bishops of *Scotland* agreed, " That the Ordering and Disposal of the external Government and Policy of the Church doth properly belong to his Majesty, as an inherent Right of the Crown, by virtue of his Royal Prerogative and Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical." And by the first Act of his second Parliament, they did likewise agree, " That his Majesty hath the Supreme Authority and Supremacy over all Persons, and in all Causes Ecclesiastical within that Kingdom; and that by virtue thereof, the Ordering and Disposal of the external Government and Policy of the Church doth properly belong to his Majesty, and his Successors, as an inherent Right to the Crown; and that his Majesty and his Successors may settle, enact, and emit such Constitutions, Acts and Orders concerning the external Administration of the Church, and the Persons imploy'd in the same, and concerning all Ecclesiastical Meetings, and Matters to be propos'd and determin'd therein, as they in their Royal Wisdom shall think fit: Which Acts, Orders, and Constitutions being recorded in the Books of Council, and duly publish'd, are to be obey'd by all his Majesty's Subjects, any Law, Act or Custom to the contrary notwithstanding."

This, according to Dr. S. was Apostacy with a vengeance; yet 'twas not so much as protested against by the Episcopal Clergy of *Scotland*, nor did they ever endeavour to have this Act repeal'd: which, by the way, lets us see what faithful Subjects they are to her Majesty, in refusing to comply with the Laws made by her Authority, and that of the Parliament, about the Affairs of the Church in that Kingdom; and how inconsistent they act with their own Principles, when they consented to invest K. Charles II. and his Successors with such an Absolute Power in Ecclesiastical Matters, without any further Concurrence of Parliamentary Authority. But why they should refuse to pay the same deference to the Queen and Parliament now, unless it be that they question the Lawfulness of her Title and their Authority, let the Doctor give a reason if he can; especially since 'tis very well known, that when they mov'd for a Toleration in the Parliament of *Scotland*, they positively refus'd to take the Oaths to the Queen: and some of their Advocates did say in the face of the House, That if the said Oaths were requir'd, the Toleration would be no kindness to them. Yet these are the Men for whom our High-fliers do so much concern themselves, and make such rueful Clamours of the dreadful Persecutions they suffer, because they are not allow'd to set up *Jacobite* Conventicles, and to introduce new Modes of Worship contrary to their own former Practice and declar'd Principles, merely to imbroil that part of the Nation, and to keep the Pretender's Friends there in countenance.

Since the Doctor has thus anathematiz'd his own profess'd Friends, we are not to wonder that K. *Edward VI.* with the Church and State in his time, fall under his Censure, and be sent to keep company with the rest of the Doctor's *Falſe Brethren*, in the Lake that burns with Fire and Brimstone; for according to him, they certainly deserv'd it: But 'tis very hard, that Archbishop *Cranmer*, and our other Reforming Bishops should first be condemn'd to *Smithfield Flames* by the Papists, and then to the Flames of Hell by the Doctor, for taking out Commissions from K. *Edward VI.* "to ordain Presbyters, and to exercise Ecclesiastical Discipline; which Power was to last no longer than the King's Pleasure, as Dr. *Burnet* tells us they did, *Hist. Reform. part 2. Collect. numb. 91.* And in the same Commission they own'd all sort of Jurisdiction, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil, to flow originally from the Regal Power, as from a Supreme Head, and as a Fountain and Spring of all Magistracy within his own Kingdom; and that they who exercis'd this Jurisdiction formerly, had done it only *precario*; and that they ought with grateful Minds to acknowledg this Favour deriv'd from the King's Liberality and Indulgence; and that accordingly they ought to yield it up, whenever the King thought fit to require it of them."

We are not to suppose, that those worthy Prelates and Martyrs did less understand what belong'd to them by Divine Authority as Ministers, or were less zealous for maintaining it than their Successors in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time, who to obviate all Scruples of that Nature declar'd at the close of her Injunctions in 1559. that she challeng'd no more Power or Authority than what was challeng'd and us'd by King *Henry VIII.* and King *Edward VI.* and therefore disclaim'd all Authority and Power of Ministry of Divine Offices in the Church. Which sufficiently proves, that Archbishop *Cranmer*, and those other worthy Bishops did not oblige themselves to surrender their Power as Presbyters to the King, but only their Power as Prelates, when he should require it; which was very consistent with their Principles, because they look'd upon that Power not to be a Divine but Human Institution, as 'twas declar'd to be by the Laws of the Land.

So that their Submission to the King in that respect cannot in the least justify the *Erastian* Principle, tho it certainly condemns that of *Laud* and his Party, who attempted to exercise that Power independent of the Crown, which they deriv'd from it; and it does no less condemn the like Designs of our present High-fliers, express'd in Mr. *Lefly's Pontificate and Regale*, &c. where they plead for the like Independency as is enjoy'd by the Church of *Scotland*, without considering that that Church has no Civil Power, makes no part of the State but as common Subjects, has no Place in Parliament, nor so much as a Vote in chusing one Member; so that they hold nothing of the State, but their common Protection and Liberty. And as all this shews the Injustice of the Pretensions of our modern High-Church, it justifies the Rebuke which the Queen

Queen gave to the Lower House of Convocation the 8th of April 1707. and her Resolution express'd therein to maintain her Supremacy, as vested in her by Law; for 'tis indeed ridiculous to think, that any part of the State should be independent of their common Supreme Head, in the Exercise of any Civil Power which they derive from it.

The Doctor's Charge, p. 10. that Occasional-Conformity is Hypocrisy, reflects upon all our Reformers, who kept Occasional Communion with the Reform'd Churches beyond Sea, during their Exile in Queen *Mary's* Time, tho they differ'd from our Church in Government, Discipline, and Modes of Worship; and also reflects upon the Practice of our Travellers, who communicate with them, and is contrary to the Article of our Creed, which holds a Communion of Saints. No Man of Sense did ever think this to consist in an Uniformity of Rites and Modes, which was never yet known in the World, nor perhaps ever will, but in holding to Christ our common Head, and in believing and practising according to the fundamental Truths of Christianity, which are excellently sum'd up in that call'd the Apostles Creed.

Among other Monuments of the brotherly Correspondence and Communion of our Church with those abroad, there's a whole Volume of Letters in the Church-Registers of *Zurich*; by which it appears our Bishops and others treated those Churches as Brethren, and testify'd their Displeasure at Queen *Elizabeth's* Stiffness for not yielding to a Reformation of those things, which might have brought the Church of *England* to a nearer Agreement with that, and other Reform'd Churches. Besides, the Doctor not only condemns our antient Reformers, but the Lord Bishop of *London*, and others of our present Churchmen, who correspond with *Geneva*, and have testify'd their Dislike at the indecent Reflections which some of our hot-headed Divines have thought fit to cast upon that Church, and their first Reformers, *Calvin, Beza, &c.*

His Reflection upon such of our Dissenters at home, as occasionally conform to the Church of *England*, discovers his want of Charity as well as Knowledge of the true State of that Controversy: for as all the Members of the Church of *England* are not agreed in the Necessity, or indeed Expediency of imposing those things wherein they differ from the Dissenters, as terms of Communion; so neither are the Dissenters all of a Mind, as to the Causes of their Dissent. Any Man who has read the Conferences appointed at the *Savoy* betwixt the two Parties by King *Charles II.* may be satisfy'd of this; for tho they all agreed against an universal and constant Communion, in every thing requir'd by the Act of Uniformity, yet many of them both approv'd and practis'd Occasional Conformity with the Church from that very time. This they did to testify to the World, that they look'd upon the Church of *England* as a true Church, and would hold Communion with her as such, but not that they would be thereby understood to approve of any thing against which they had enter'd their Dissent.

So that the Doctor is very unjust, as well as uncharitable, to charge Men with Hypocrisy for acting according to their declar'd Principles; he might as well charge such Lords and Commons, as disagree to any thing voted in either House, with Hypocrisy, for continuing to act in a Parliamentary Way with those they have dissented from: And if the same Liberty be not allow'd in Matters Ecclesiastical, there can be no such thing as a Communion among Christian Churches in the World. 'Tis own'd in the Article concerning the Service of the Church, before the Book of Common-Prayer, that formerly there was great Diversity in Saying and Singing in Churches within this Realm, some following the Customs of *Salisbury*, some of *Hereford*, some of *Bangor*, some of *York*, and some of *Lincoln*; yet that was never understood to break the Communion of the Church, no more than the great and remarkable difference at present betwixt the Cathedral and Parochial Worship, is conceiv'd to do. And since in the Article of Ceremonies, *why some be abolish'd and some retain'd*, the Church has declar'd her Opinion, that every Country shou'd use such Ceremonies as they think best, and that for this they condemn no other Nations; let the Doctor see how he can reconcile his fiery and uncharitable Reflections, not only upon Dissenters at home, but upon Protestant Churches abroad, with this moderate Spirit of the Church; and whether he does not include the whole Church of *England* under his Notion of *false Brethren*, since he accounts all those such as wou'd give up any part of her Discipline and Worship, when she her self has declar'd in the Preface to the Book of Common-Prayer, *That the particular Forms of Divine Worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be us'd therein, being things in their own Nature indifferent and alterable, 'tis but reasonable, that upon weighty and important Considerations, according to the Exigency of Times and Occasions, such Changes and Alterations shou'd be made therein, as to those that are in Place of Authority shou'd from time to time seem either necessary or expedient.*

With what front then can this malicious Incendiary arraign the Queen and Parliament as Countenancers of Schism, and Setters-up of a *Mungrel-Union* of all Sects by the *Toleration*, for doing less than the Church her self owns they had Authority to do? for instead of making any Alteration in the Forms, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Church, which they might certainly have done, according to the 34th Article, they have contented themselves with setting the Dissenters at Liberty from the Penal Laws, which oblig'd them to a Conformity to those Ceremonies. And since by the Laws of the Land, and the Opinion of our first Reformers, the *English Prelacy* appears to be a Creature of the State; with what forehead can this Man, with the *Rehearsal* and others, arraign the Queen and Parliament, as having set up a Rebellion like that of *Korah*, for exempting the *English* Dissenters from Episcopal Jurisdiction, and laying it quite aside in *Scotland*? Are not the Queen and Parliament Judges of what

what is necessary and expedient for maintaining the Peace of their Dominions, or for entertaining an Union among Protestants? And since in the Preface to the *Toleration-Act*, they have declar'd that to be the Design of it; Ought not this Man to be treated as an Incendiary, who so publickly rails at their Proceedings from the Pulpit, and calls them *false Brethren*, with relation both to Church and State?

'Twould swell these Reflections too much to take notice of all his Extravagancies, which justly deserve a Rebuke. Therefore I shall confine my self to a few more things, which to me appear most remarkable.

Page 12. He says, *That whoever presumes to innovate, alter, or misrepresent any Point in the Articles of the Faith of our Church, ought to be arraign'd as a-Traitor to our State.* Every one knows this is pointed at the Lord Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of our Articles: I shall not take upon me the Defence of that Learned Person, whose Works have procur'd him so great an Esteem; he is so well able to do it himself, that 'twere Arrogance in another to attempt it. But I am apt to think his Lordship's Moderation, and early Appearance and Zeal for the Revolution, with his Opposition to the Tyranny of the late Reigns, is at the bottom of this Charge. But if all Innovators, Alterers, and Misrepresenters of our Articles, must be arraign'd as Traitors to the State; what must become of K. William's Reputation, and of the Lives and Fortunes of such Lords and Commons as consented to the *Toleration-Act*, which exempts the Dissenters from signing several of those Articles? And what must become of her present Majesty, who has given her Royal Word from the Throne, that *She will inviolably maintain the Toleration?* But since we have no reason to suppose the Doctor much concern'd what becomes of them, we shall put a question which concerns him more nearly; and that is, What must become of his High-flying Brethren, that have cultivated and hug'd the Sovereign Drug of *Arminianism*, which the Jesuits boasted they had planted here in the Reign of K. Charles I. in order to introduce Popery? I am much afraid, that if all those who put an *Arminian* Gloss upon our Articles, were to be arraign'd as Traitors, the High-Church would soon be brought Low enough. But further, what shall become of those of his High-flying Brethren, who in imitation of Dr. Heylin, ABp Laud, and the rest of his Faction, would put a Popish Gloss upon them; as 'tis evident Dr. Heylin did, in his Preface to the Life of that Prelate?

But there's another Question, which comes yet more close upon his High-Church (and the Reputation of their Patriarch ABp Laud) for not only innovating, but altering the 20th Article of the Church in a fraudulent and clandestine manner, by their own Authority: which being question'd in the Reign of K. Charles I. when the High-Church attempted not only to swallow up the Subjects, but the Crown, and to act independently upon it, the Archbishop was oblig'd to have recourse to a plain Falshood, to defend that Interpolation in the 20th Article, which asserts a

Power in the Church to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and her having Authority in Controversies of Faith: And said in his Speech in the Star-Chamber, at the Censure of *Pryn, Burton, and Bastwick*, p. 69. That his Officer whom he had deputed to search, had found it extant in the Records of his Office, and that he had afterwards return'd it to him. The Archbishop did not print the Attestation of his Officer, which is usual in such cases; and he would not certainly have omitted it, had it been true. But that which puts the matter beyond all controversy, is, that the original Copys of the Articles, which he pretended were in his Office, were really bequeath'd by *ABp Parker* long before, with the rest of his Manuscripts, to *Bennet-College* in *Cambridge*, where they are still extant; with the Subscriptions of those that compos'd them in their own Hands: and to prevent Corruption, not only every Article, but all the Lines in every Page are number'd, and there is not one word of that Interpolation above-mention'd in them.

As a further Proof of this Falsification, I have a Copy of the Articles agreed upon in the Convocation of 1562. and confirm'd by that of 1571. when they were reprinted by *Q. Elizabeth's* Authority without that Interpolation either in the Text or Margin; and it is *verbatim* thus.

Of the Authoritie of the Church.

'Tis not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written; neyther may it so expounde one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a Witnesse and a Keper of holy Writ: yet, as it ought not to decree any thynge against the same; so besides the same, ought it not to enforce any thynge to be believed for necessitie of Salvation.

For the Satisfaction of the Publick, the printed Copy of the Articles in *Q. Elizabeth's* time is left with *Mr. Darby* the Printer, for the Justification of what I have said.

'Tis further to be observ'd, as a Confirmation of this notorious Imposition upon the Nation, that the 21st of the Articles drawn up in *K. Edward VI's* time, which is upon the same Subject, agrees with the 20th of *Q. Elizabeth* *verbatim*; and these Articles were agreed by the Bishops and other Learned Men, in the Convocation held at *London* 1552. and publish'd by the King's Authority. So that *Dr. Burnet* seems to have been impos'd on by this common Error in his *History of the Reformation*, par. 2. since in the Collection of Records, at the end of that Book, p. 214. he sets down the Interpolation on the margin of the 21st Article of *Edward VI.* as contain'd in the 20th of *Q. Elizabeth* of 1562.

It may likewise be observ'd, as a yet fuller proof of this Interpolation, that when the Convocation did again approve and confirm the Articles in 1571. after they had been deliberately read, and receiv'd the Queen's Assent and Consent; there's nothing of this Interpolation, either in the Text or Margin of the 20th Article. 'Tis also remarkable, that there's a material difference betwixt what they added to the 33d Article of *Edward VI.* of the Tradition of the Church, as printed in *Dr. Burnet's* Collection.

lection of Records, after his first Volume of *Hist. Reform.* p. 218. and what is added to the 34th Article of the Edition 1571. on the same Subject. For whereas in the Addition to that Article mention'd by the Doctor, 'tis said, *Every Particular OR National Church hath Authority to ordain, change, or abolish Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, ordain'd only by Man's Authority, so that all things be done to edifying :* in Q. Eliz. Edition of 1571. 'tis, *Every Particular AND National Church ;* which would seem to imply that every particular Congregation has the same Power. For according to Art. 19. every Congregation, in which the pure Word of God is preach'd and the Sacraments duly administer'd, &c. is a particular Church : and what they cou'd mean else by a *Particular Church* as distinguish'd from a *National* one, is hard to be conceiv'd. Be it how 'twill, we may perceive the Reformation begun to go retrograde in Q. Elizabeth's time, from what 'twas in the time of King Edward ; tho if the Scripture be allow'd for the Rule of Edification, and of the Church's Decrees, as it seems to be by Art. 21. this Addition to Art. 34. can be no Justification of those who would impose on the Consciences of their Brethren. However, it shews the Christian Tendernefs of our Legislature, that they have freed the Dissenters from subscribing to this Article by the Toleration-Act : in which the Parliament is justify'd by this very Addition, which they had power to change, since 'tis only of human Authority.

Had Dr. Sach. been aware of this, perhaps he would not have been so severe upon the Innovators and Alterers of our Articles : but we may justly say with the Psalmist, in relation to these High-Church Innovators, who wou'd ascribe to the Church of *England* as much Power as is assum'd by the Church of *Rome*, *What shall be given unto thee, or what shall be done unto thee, thou false Tongue ? sharp Arrows of the Mighty, with Coals of Juniper,* Psal. 120. 3, 4. For the Power they wou'd have given to our Church by this Interpolation, is contrary to what she says her self in the very next Article of *the Authority of General Councils*, where she declares, that *things ordain'd by them as necessary to Salvation, have neither Strength nor Authority, unless it may be declar'd that they be taken out of H. Scripture.*

The Doctor being sensible that in the former part of his Discourse he had run a muck against the Authority of King and Parliament for having granted a Toleration, and against the Authority of the Queen who has promis'd to support it ; he tells us, p. 19. *I wou'd not here be misunderstood, as if I intended to cast the least invidious Reflection upon that Indulgence the Government has condescended to give them, which I am sure all those that wish well to our Church are very ready to grant to Consciences truly scrupulous.* But every body may see this is a *Protestation contrary to Fact*, and not to be regarded. Can he in his Conscience allow a Toleration to those whom he has all along branded as Schismatics, Traitors, false Brethren, Underminers of the Church, execrable Villains, Fanaticks, Regicides, Men of Hellish Principles, which they openly profess and teach ? How will he reconcile this
with

with his railing at ABp Grindal in that same Page, and commending Q. Eliz. for her true Resolution, and pious Zeal in saying, *That such were the restless Spirits of that factious People, that no Quiet was to be expected from them till they were utterly suppress'd, which like a prudent Princess she did by wholesom Severities ; and had her Successor K. James but follow'd her wise Politicks, his Son had never fallen a Martyr to their Fury, nor any of his unhappy Offspring suffer'd those disastrous Calamities which made the Royal Family one continu'd Sacrifice to their Malice. And what better could have been expected from Miscreants begot in Rebellion, born in Sedition, and bred up in Faction ?*

If the Doctor thinks that People of such a Character ought to be tolerated, every Man must own he is a greater Knave himself than he pretends them to be ; but the best on't is, his Character of 'em is known to be false. Their Conduct since the Revolution makes this evident to all the World. Who of them have been concern'd in Invasion and Assassination Plots against King, Queen, or Government, since that time ? yet every one knows that several of his High-Church have been hang'd for both, and confess'd it at the Gallows, as 'twas fully prov'd upon them at their Trials. Which of the Dissenters disown her Majesty's Title, or teach any Doctrine to sap its Foundation ?

For his charging 'em with the Murder of K. Charles, and the following Disasters of the Royal Family, 'tis no more to be ascrib'd to the whole Body of Dissenters, than the late Assassination-Plots and design'd Invasions are to be charg'd upon the whole Church of England, because those that had a hand in them declar'd they dy'd in that Communion. Besides, 'tis well known that those concern'd in the Murder of K. Charles, were a hotch-potch of different Denominations ; and as the 12 of Charles II. chap. 30. expresses it, *A few Miscreants, as far from being true Protestants, as from being true Subjects.* The Dr. ought to look nearer home, for the fatal occasion of all those Disasters, viz. the arbitrary Proceedings which Men of his stamp put K. James and K. Charles upon, defended them for Gospel ; and with the same Spirit of Charity, for which the Dr. is so very remarkable, condemn'd all who wou'd dispute his illegal exacting of Shipmony, Adjournments and Delays of Parliament, to the bottomless Pit. He has also been told before, that the much greater part of the Members of Parliament, who took Arms against K. Charles, were Church of England Men, who were so far from designing the Destruction of his Person, or the Subversion of his Government, that they did what they cou'd to preserve both, and wou'd certainly have effected it, had not those of the High Church Principles made him deaf to all Proposals of Accommodation till 'twas too late.

'Tis equally well known, that those who contriv'd the Murder of K. Charles cou'd never effect it, till they got the Presbyterians excluded from the Parliament and Army ; that those of that Denomination in all the three Kingdoms oppos'd his Trial by Protestations : and the Kingdom of Scotland, where Presbyte-ry was then settled, as now, oppos'd it by Arms ; and as soon as he

he was murder'd, proclaim'd his Son, whose Cause they espous'd till they themselves were over-run by the victorious Troops of the Usurpers: To which the bad Measures which those of the High Church about K. Charles II. put him upon, contributed more than *Oliver's* Arms; for the People perceiving by undeniable Proofs, that the King never intended to keep one word of what he had promis'd, and he himself having convinc'd 'em of it, by endeavouring to make an Escape from their Army, in order to join those *Highlanders* and others who had, in conjunction with the *Irisb*, Cut-Throats, harass'd the Country with Fire and Sword in his Father's time; this cool'd their Affections towards him, divided the Country into Factions, and made *Oliver's* Conquest very easy. Yet far from totally abandoning him, they brought him with an Army to *Worcester*, which was chiefly ruin'd by the Treachery, or Cowardice at best, of the *English* High-Church or Cavaliers, who fail'd in the Promises they had made to join him, as they did before to the D. of *Hamilton*, who came with an Army as far as *Preston* in *Lancashire* to rescue K. Charles I. out of Prison. So that on all these Occasions the Presbyterians spent their Blood for the King and the Royal Family, while most of the High Church contented themselves to drink his Health, as too many of them do now that of the Pretender.

Notwithstanding all these Disasters and Causes of Diffidence, the Presbyterians of both Nations were the chief Instruments of restoring the King and the Royal Family; which was own'd by K. Charles II. himself in Parliament, when he told the Lords, That he ought to make good his Declaration from *Breda* to the Presbyterians, because without their Assistance neither he nor they cou'd ever have had any Prospekt of sitting there. But how well he rewarded them afterwards, every one knows.

Whether the Dr. will own it or no, is no great matter; but 'tis well enough known that the Act of Uniformity, contriv'd by his High Church, and the Penal Laws made afterwards to enforce it in order to divide the Protestants, laid the foundation of all K. Charles's succeeding Troubles, encourag'd the Papists to form Plots, and the Court to cut off such Church of *England* Men and others as stood up for our Constitution, to seize the Charters of our Corporations, and to dispense with our Laws, which our High Church Clergy, Universities and Judges had maintain'd to be the King's Prerogative. This brought in Popery and Slavery like a Deluge upon us, till we were deliver'd from it by the late happy Revolution, and by taking Arms to throw off the Yoke, contrary to his slavish and traitorous Doctrine, That 'tis not lawful to resist Princes on any pretence whatsoever.

But we are not to wonder at the Doctor's bidding defiance to the Laws of Man, and the Constitution of his Country, when he tramples upon those of our Lord and Saviour. 'Twas the dying Legacy he left to his Disciples, and in them to all Christians, that they should love one another. This he laid down as the great Characteristick of Christianity, and the same was inculcated by his

his Apostles. But that Dr. S. and his Party and of this Spirit, is so evident from their Conduct, that it is no other proof. The Queen, the Parliament, the principal Fathers of the Church, according to the blessed Example of our Saviour and his Apostles, enjoin Union, Love, and Moderation. The Legislature, to effect this, have taken off the Penal Laws, which were the unhappy Instruments of Violence, Contention and Strife, and had brought both Church and Dissenters to the brink of Ruin: but the Doctor and his Faction being acted by a contrary Spirit, are for cursing those whom God and the Government have bless'd; and to shew how sincere he was in his allowing a Toleration, p. 19. he leaves his *false Brethren*, as he calls them, viz. the moderate Churchmen and Dissenters, in the bottomless Lake, with the Grand Father of Falshood, the Devil and his Angels; *the Company which*, according to this good-natur'd Levite, p. 22. *they always keep Correspondence with.* And that he might send them thither in a fiery Chariot, he advises our superior Pastors to thunder out their Ecclesiastical Anathema's against them.

Alas poor Man! does he think the Legislature, who have set the Dissenters at Liberty from the Penal Laws, have left them expos'd for their Dissent to the Canons of the Church? I fear he is as bad a Lawyer as Divine. Does not he know yet, that the Canons receiv'd their Force from the Royal Sanction, and that without the Authority of the Prince, the Convocation could not assemble to make 'em? How then can he have the Confidence to advise our Bishops to act contrary to Law? Has not the Legislature withdrawn their Ratification of those Canons, which relate to the Principles of Dissenters? And does not the Doctor know, that by 25 H. 8. c. 19. and 1 Eliz. c. 1. §. 6. the Canons and Constitutions of the Church are of no force without the King or Queen's Assent? But this is the true Spirit of High-Church, they wou'd have the Mitre overtop the Crown now, as *Laud* and his Party intended it should by their Canons of 1640. which were made void by the 13 Car. 2. c. 12.

We see the Spirit of the Party, they are for Tyranny in the Church as well as State, and cover all by a false Pretext of Divine Authority: for let Bishops and Princes act ever so plainly the part of the Devil, yet still they must be accounted God's Vicegerents; which makes the Faction liable to the Curse pronounc'd against those *who call Evil Good, and Good Evil.*

If this Spirit be the Spirit of God, our Saviour and his Apostles have strangely deceiv'd us. The High-flying Faction may call themselves Churchmen as long as they please: but St. Paul would not allow 'em that Name, for he declares, that *if any Man seem to be contentious, the Church of God has no such Custom*: which I take in plain English to be, that she will entertain no such Customers, and we have the Reason from St. James, because they come from the Devil. However, I will not be so uncharitable as the Doctor was, to leave them with him and his Angels, but heartily pray for their happy Deliverance, by a sincere and speedy Repen-

F I N I S.